

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 24-1145

DONNA MARIE CONNER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

XFINITY, United States General; ASSURANCE WIRELESS USA-LP; JASON S. MIYARES, Commonwealth of Virginia, Attorney General; MARK HERRING; JENNIFER MCCLELLAN, Senator for the Commonwealth of Virginia; MARK WARNER, Senator; TIM KAINES, Virginia Beach; PETERSBURG, VIRGINIA POLICE DEPARTMENT; COLONIAL HEIGHTS VIRGINIA POLICE DEPARTMENT; YORK COUNTY VIRGINIA POLICE DEPARTMENT; RON MONTGOMERY, Sheriff; COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH PROFESSIONS,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Patricia Tolliver Giles, District Judge. (1:23-cv-01222-PTG-LRV)

Submitted: April 17, 2024

Decided: May 30, 2024

Before WILKINSON and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed and remanded by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Donna Marie Conner, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Donna Marie Conner seeks to appeal the district court's orders (1) dismissing her complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), but granting her leave to amend one claim, and (2) dismissing her amended complaint under the same statute. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292; Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). “Ordinarily, a district court order is not final until it has resolved *all* claims as to all parties.” *Porter v. Zook*, 803 F.3d 694, 696 (4th Cir. 2015) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Our review of the record reveals that the district court did not adjudicate all of the claims alleged in Conner's complaint and amended complaint. *Id.* at 696-97. Specifically, the district court never resolved Conner's claim against Greyhound.* We thus conclude that the orders Conner seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction and remand to the district court for consideration of the unresolved claim. *Id.* at 699.

We deny as moot Conner's motion to expedite decision and deny Conner's motion to appoint counsel. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions

* Both the complaint and amended complaint identified “Greyhound” as a defendant. Those pleadings alleged, among other things, that Conner had experienced delays while traveling by Greyhound bus during the summer of 2023 and that Greyhound never responded to her request for a refund premised on those delays.

are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED AND REMANDED